

Appl. No. 10/691,268  
Atty. Docket No.: 2001B105/2  
Response dated January 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JAN 17 2007

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 20-22 and 31-37 are presently pending for the Examiner's review and consideration. Applicants appreciate the Examiner's acknowledgment of the allowability of claims 31-35 and 37 on page 1 of the most recent Office Action.

Applicants further appreciate the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the telephone interview with the Examiner on November 2, 2006. The remarks herein are substantially in accord with the substantive discussions of said interview. No new matter has been added by the following remarks/arguments.

Claims 20-22 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 4,440,871 to Lok *et al.* (hereinafter "Lok"), in view of European Publication No. EP-A-463 793 to Davis (hereinafter "Davis"). Such a rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants' independent claim 20 (and thus claims 21-22 and 36, which also depend therefrom) recites a molecular sieve composition comprising a molecular sieve, which itself comprises, *inter alia*, a polymeric base. By "polymeric base," Applicants mean a polymer compound having multiple chemically basic (in the pH sense) sites. *See* the instant specification, *e.g.*, at pages 14-15. Based on the language of the rejection and Applicants' conversation with the Examiner, Applicants are clarifying herein that the term "base" was not meant to be a synonym for "substrate" in the claims. Applicants believe that this misunderstanding was the basis for the obviousness rejection over the combination of Lok and Davis.

However, even the combination of Lok and Davis does not disclose or suggest a "polymeric base" in the pH sense. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that even the combination of Lok and Davis does not disclose or suggest all the elements of claims 20-22 and 36. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the obviousness rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/691,268  
Atty. Docket No.: 2001B105/2  
Response dated January 17, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of October 17, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 17 2007

### CONCLUSION

Entry of the remarks presented herein is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully requested that the Examiner expeditiously notify Applicants' undersigned attorney as to the disposition of the amendments and remarks presented herein in accordance with MPEP §714.13.

Any comments or questions concerning the application can be directed to the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1/17/07



David M. Weisberg  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 57,636

Post Office Address (to which correspondence is to be sent):  
ExxonMobil Chemical Company  
Law Technology  
P.O. Box 2149  
Baytown, Texas 77522-2149  
Telephone No. (281) 834-0599  
Facsimile No. (281) 834-2495